

JAN 4 2016

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

SUSAN Y. SOONG
CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

United States of America,) Case No. CR 15-mj-71637
)
)
Plaintiff,)
)
v.) STIPULATED ORDER EXCLUDING TIME
) UNDER THE SPEEDY TRIAL ACT
Estuardo Vasquez Rodriguez)
Defendant.)

For the reasons stated by the parties on the record on Jan. 4, ²⁰¹⁶~~2015~~, the Court excludes ~~time~~
~~time under the Speedy Trial Act from Jan. 4~~, 201⁶~~5~~ to Jan 7, 201⁶~~5~~ and
finds that the ends of justice served by the continuance outweigh the best interest of the public
and the defendant in a speedy trial. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(A). The Court makes this
finding and bases this continuance on the following factor(s):

____ Failure to grant a continuance would be likely to result in a miscarriage of justice.
See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(i).

____ The case is so unusual or so complex, due to [*check applicable reasons*] ____ the number
of defendants, ____ the nature of the prosecution, or ____ the existence of novel questions of
fact or law, that it is unreasonable to expect adequate preparation for pretrial proceedings or the
trial itself within the time limits established by this section. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(ii).

____ Failure to grant a continuance would deny the defendant reasonable time to obtain
counsel, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).

____ Failure to grant a continuance would unreasonably deny the defendant continuity of
counsel, given counsel's other scheduled case commitments, taking into account the exercise of
due diligence. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).

____ Failure to grant a continuance would unreasonably deny the defendant the reasonable
time necessary for effective preparation, taking into account the exercise of due diligence.
See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: 1/4/16

The defendant waives the time limit under
Rule 5.1 of the court grants a continuance for
arraignment / preliminary hearing


LAUREL BEELER
United States Magistrate Judge

STIPULATED: 

Attorney for Defendant


Katherine G. Newmyer
Assistant United States Attorney